

## **SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**April 21, 2014**

**4:30 p.m.**

The Clerk called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Alderman Corriveau, School Committee Member Ambrogi,  
Alderman Shea, School Committee Member Connors, Alderman  
Shaw, School Committee Member Staub

Messrs: K. Burkush

3. [Discussion regarding the School District budget.](#)

Alderman Corriveau stated we will begin our discussion regarding the FY15 school district budget, and I believe we have representatives from the school district here with us this evening.

Ms. Karen Burkush, Assistant Superintendent of Student Services, stated Karen DeFrancis is off today and the Superintendent is at the Department of Education for a meeting with the commissioner so I'm here to field any questions you might have and I'll bring them back to Karen DeFrancis. She's probably the person who would best answer any of the financial questions.

Alderman Corriveau stated thank you for joining us today. Are there any questions from the committee, not only for the assistant superintendent, but to

foster dialogue amongst ourselves? Obviously the City and school budgets are due the second Tuesday of June. The board of school committee by the superintendent submitted their budget request to the aldermen, and Mayor Gatsas has also proposed his school budget to the aldermen. Alderman Shaw or Alderman Shea could help me recollect, was it Tuesday that the superintendent testified before the full board?

Ms. Burkush stated I believe it was Wednesday.

Alderman Shea stated just by way of discussion I think I was in touch with you erroneously today because I was trying to get in touch with Karen, so you're aware of what my request was and I believe you're going to carry that message to her.

Ms. Burkush replied yes I will bring that question back to Karen DeFrancis.

Alderman Shea stated the question was, and it's just speculation, but the impact of the school budget if the MEA agreed to pay 15% of their health benefits. Right now they pay 7% so I'm not sure. The superintendent lead us to believe that there are ongoing discussions. Whether there are or not she indicated that when a question was raised by one of the aldermen so possibly that would be a help.

Ms. Burkush stated you're correct about ongoing negotiations; those continue.

Alderman Shea stated the other question that I had has to do with the additional personnel in terms of administration in the schools with the three assistant principals as well as the five. I just wondered if that would have a double impact because if there are presently three employees of the school department and they decided that they would like to aspire to assistant principals at the high school,

would that mean that three additional teachers would have to be hired at an additional expense to replace them, as well as the five that are proposed for the elementary schools? I'm not sure exactly if we have to hire eight more people if people who are presently within the school system are selected. That would be my question too. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Committeewoman Ambrogi stated thank you, Alderman Corriveau. First of all I think I would respond that I know that the calculations regarding the impact of the health contribution have been done before in prior rounds of negotiating, so I believe Karen DeFrancis will be able to put those numbers together. You have to look at it in kind of a three-year impact because there can be different impacts on the first year of a contract versus subsequent years. It is a good question and the answer may not necessarily be simple. The other thing I just wanted to comment on is that I wanted to commend the administration for the way they brought their budget forward this year. They did very specifically tie the additions that they made to the budget to the strategic goals that were put together last year by the strategic planning committee last session, and so I think that the budget was very well done in terms of showing what it is that we're trying to accomplish and how it is we will be accomplishing it. I would also just say that I think it is a very responsible budget that was brought forward, and it is clear that one of the things, and I knew this before, but I find it very interesting to look at again is just the pie chart on page 8 of the budget presentation. Seventy-four percent of our expenditures are in the area of salaries and benefits, so there's been a lot of discussion at various meetings and over time about other ways we could potentially save money, but I think you have to see that the huge impact is salaries and benefits, it is not saving some money on a ream of paper here and there. That may help a little, but it's not going to change that overall impact. Those are just some things, but I do want to commend the administration for bringing forward a

responsible budget and one that really ties to what it is we're trying to accomplish to improve education in the City going forward.

Alderman Shea stated just a point of clarification. I'm just talking about the present budget in terms of the information because obviously they really don't have a budget right now. So it would just be how it's going to impact the present City budget. A very important point was raised that if in fact there is a three-year budget naturally, that it is just for this present budget because we have serious problems with that.

Alderman Corriveau stated I have a couple of questions for you. Both issues were briefly addressed before the full Board of Mayor and Aldermen, and I was just hoping to maybe flush them out a little bit. The first is the issue of revenue. I know some aldermen were saying you have a \$1 million surplus and we'd like it back. The school district said that they're including that \$1 million surplus as a revenue in the next fiscal year. I have the budget summary in front of us and in the one line item is that included as a revenue? For example, is it subsidizing the operating tuition line item? I don't know. I'm not sure where exactly to find that as a revenue. My second question is tied into that and would be if the \$1 million surplus is being included as a revenue for next fiscal year, at least in the budget some way in front of us, the revenues from last year to this year are \$15.3 million to \$15.6 million. Would revenues be down to \$14.6 million without the \$1 million surplus or was this \$1 million...okay, I do see it now. Thank you

Committeewoman Ambrogi. Let me rephrase the question. Without the fiscal year 2014 surplus of \$1 million, school district revenues would be down  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a million dollars? Would that be my understanding?

Committeewoman Ambrogi replied I think that's correct. I think there is, and I would defer to Karen DeFrancis absolutely to make sure this is absolutely correct.

If you look at the top line of revenues of operating tuition, there is a slight increase and I believe there will be fewer students tuitioning in, however, there was negotiated a higher rate for those students. So I think that's the reason, and I'm not looking at how that number was calculated, but I believe that's what it comes from. So we will in fact have fewer students, but I think it is also correct that without any surplus going in, we would have reduced revenues from what we have this year.

Committeewoman Connors stated the majority of it, as I understood, came from the drop in impact fees from the City as well. We were looking at about a \$1 million decrease in revenue on that line item, so that's why we needed to make up for it with that \$1 million surplus.

Chairman Corriveau asked have any of you heard anything about why the big one year drop in impact fees from the City? Has that come up before you at all?

Ms. Burkush stated I would ask Karen DeFrancis that.

Chairman Corriveau stated if we could get that information, I think that would be helpful to the aldermen.

Committeewoman Connors stated I would just be speculating; I'm not really sure.

Committeewoman Staub stated I think that was kind of a one-time money deal and that the money had been sitting in the impact fee account and we decided that in order to balance the budget we were going to utilize that money and it was more than we generally would take out of that fund.

Alderman Shea stated just a quick reference here. People have to understand that there are two types of listed tuitions. One is the operating tuition that students pay, which has been increased, but the other has to do with the capital costs that are coming to the City. We have to distinguish between those two. I think that sometimes people get a little bit confused because they wonder how come there are capital costs. That is what they have agreed to pay for the repairs of the schools and that was adopted in 2001. I just want that clarified so people can understand that.

Chairman Corriveau stated this question is for Ms. Burkush or members of this committee. There was a question at our last full board meeting of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen asking about the difference, I believe it is about a \$500,000 difference, between the school district's budget and the mayor's proposed budget. Dr. Livingston's answer was essentially that we acknowledge there's a \$500,000 deficit where differences may occur between the Mayor's budget and the school district's budget, however, it was left a little bit unclear where that \$500,000 would be realized. Would it be realized in fewer teachers, in fewer assistant principals, or maybe decreasing other line items? I don't know if that's been discussed at all.

Committeewoman Connors stated I think what we were looking at was \$1.5 million in surplus right now. Karen, is that right?

Ms. Burkush replied I believe so. The \$1 million was going to be used as a source for revenue to make up for that decrease coming from this year, and then the additional \$500,000 would be put into the budget so we would actually be able to allocate the resources the way the superintendents have planned.

Chairman Corriveau stated so you're saying essentially there would be no difference between the two proposed budgets then.

Committeewoman Connors replied correct. That's the way I understand it for right now. That's what the superintendent said.

Ms. Burkush stated I recall the superintendent said she would be bringing it back to the board and asking those questions of the board as to what would be their priorities. She would have a proposal but at this point in time she really didn't have anything specific.

Chairman Corriveau asked was anything brought to the committee at your last meeting?

Alderman Shea stated I think what Karen said was that there are certain trust funds that are available, health trusts and so forth, and I think the money that would be realized, if any, would go into those in terms of making sure that they would have resources in case they were overspent. That's really what I thought she said at our meeting, that any additional surpluses that may be realized would go into the health trust fund or others, there are others too, I don't know the names of all of them. That's what my understanding was.

Committeewoman Ambrogi stated I think, and I apologize for not having more specifics, I think what Alderman Shea stated is correct. The health trust fund tends to be the one that has the most significant balance in it. We've had discussions at prior board meetings in terms of how much really makes sense to have in there considering that we are self-insured and that's where any sort of catastrophic claim would have to be paid from. There are also special trust funds for special education, for example, and there are several others. I think the other

thing Karen DeFrancis has definitely cautioned us on is that we won't really know that final number of what our actual surplus will be towards the end of the year until we get to the end of the fiscal year. But I think the other thing that I've heard Dr. Livingston state, and this has not been discussed at the full board, is basically we would have to make choices in terms of if we receive less in our budget than has been proposed, we would have to look at and weigh out, for example, assistant principals versus teaching positions. I don't know that we'd have many other ways to do it if we didn't get enough in the budget. There might be certain things that we don't achieve next year.

Committeewoman Connors stated I would agree. I believe she said if the numbers dropped below what either her or the Mayor proposed, then it definitely would have to come back to the board to decide item by item what we would do. But I do believe she said that she was not going to do that until we had a budget number.

Committeewoman Ambrogi stated I think that's correct.

Chairman Corriveau stated so essentially this is an open matter for discussion with the school board, at least for the time being, and when a final budget is presented to the school board that's the time that decision would be made.

Committeewoman Ambrogi stated that was the way it was discussed at the meeting where we voted on the budget that in general we accepted the superintendent's proposal for how to allocate resources, but that if resources came back substantially different from what was proposed, we would have to at that point make some choices and work with the superintendent to decide the best way to do that.



Chairman Corriveau stated Committeewoman Staub it looked like you might have had a question a couple of minutes ago.

Committeewoman Staub stated I was also going to say that if any additional money came in it would be from the expendable trusts.

Chairman Corriveau stated while we have Karen up here, do we have any other questions from the committee on any budget related matters.

Alderman Shea stated the only point I have is that the debt service keeps rising, and I'm not sure whether it has reached the apex, because last year it was \$12.182 million and this year it is \$12 to \$13 million. That does have an impact, and I'm just wondering if the debt service that the school...of course it impacts several different concerns that they have regarding different types of priorities but if you could just check and see what projection might be for the next few years that would be good. I think that is important both from the school considering things as well as other kinds of concerns that others might have.

Committeewoman Connors stated the Buildings & Sites Committee was looking at that as well. They were looking for a long-range plan for the next 5 to 10 years including debt service into those calculations as well.

Alderman Shea stated that answers the question.

Committeewoman Staub stated I just wanted to answer a question that I heard you ask the other night about the \$250,000 for technology. You asked about whether we could bond for that. The bond money has been used to do the infrastructure at the schools, both the hardwiring and the wiring for Wifi, and then they've purchased groups of computers to create computer labs for graphic arts classes and

IT classes, and hopefully next year we're going to be teaching AP computer science in all of the classes, so if anyone out there is interested in computer science, be looking to take that course. So we've now got all of this infrastructure in the schools so that we can enable our teachers to use technology in the classroom. The \$250,000 is for tablets, chrome books, and the small computers, which are considered commodities now. They are expected to have a life of about three years so those are not bondable. We have been so far behind the curve and we're waiting for teachers to have enough professional development so that they are ready to use the equipment. The way technology is changing so rapidly, if we bought a whole bunch of computers now they would just gather dust and be obsolete. The reality is that with technology going as fast as it is, you could buy a better computer a year from now for less money. So Jeff Delangie is buying what he needs. This year we're going to be three students to one computer and then it goes to two-to-one and then hopefully it will go one-to-one and that's pretty much what all school districts around the country are looking at doing at this point. I really feel like that's where we want Manchester to be, with everybody else.

Committeewoman Ambrogi stated just for Alderman Shea's assistance. Although I hesitate to get too deep into detail in terms of explaining each of these line items, on page 81 in the budget presentation there is a breakdown of that debt service amount so you can see what it consists of. The first line, which is the bulk of it is the debt schedule for City finance so those are existing bonds that we're already paying debt service on. There are some new items this year. You'll notice sort of between FY12 and FY15 the shifting. Instead of the textbook loan, which courtesy of the aldermen we no longer are paying, we are going to be paying on the technology bond that we took out last year, which was doing basically infrastructure, and long-term planning types of technology investments. Then there's the energy efficiency bond and the bonding for the buses that was discussed a little bit the other night. That's what it is made up of. I would

definitely defer to Karen DeFrancis for more detail on it, but at least it helps a little bit.

Chairman Corriveau stated I guess to sort of to go back to the purpose of this committee there are certain issues that involve both the City and the school district. Technology and infrastructure are certainly one of them, transportation and others, security would be a third, and obviously the budget being the biggest of them all. Going forward we have about just less than two months by charter that the City and school budget will go into effect. Committeewoman Staub had mentioned to me an issue that sort of first came to this committee's attention last year. We didn't go too far with it, but it is the issue of looking into a facilities plan, and I don't know if that's anything Committeewoman Staub or any of you would like to speak to for a moment here. We have some parents with us that I know, with the committee's indulgence, would like to ask some redistricting questions which I think would also be enlightening for the aldermen. For the purposes of our next meeting and especially in the couple of months, any particular issues that any member of this committee would like to bring forward, obviously any budget related matters, as well as facilities would certainly be one that's already come to our attention, and I know last year we had a good conversation going about school security initiatives. With that I'll just leave it to the committee.

Alderman Shaw stated there is something that just sort of bothers me semantically. Redistricting and reorganization are two different things. Redistricting involves redrawing lines or districts so that kids that might be going to one school would then be going to a different school or that type of thing. That's redistricting. Developing a plan like was proposed for Jewett or Southside to me is more than redistricting. It is a reorganization plan, and I think there's a difference so that when these things are brought forward, I would like to see a distinction when

they're brought forward to the people, to us, to the board. Is this a redistricting plan where lines are going to be redrawn so that certain kids will go certain places or is it a reorganization plan where the school will be no longer be the same structure that it is now? To me that's an important point.

Committeewoman Connors stated one of the parents here actually brought that forward the other day and had several questions, so I think that's going to be coming up. I will be bringing up several questions regarding that at the school board meeting so we can get direction for what we are looking for the superintendent to do. We need clarification because we don't want to be at this point and have her come up with plan, whether it's redistricting or reorganization, and have the school board decide that's not what we wanted to do. I think we are going to be asking for a few clarifying questions for the board to decide on and figure out what direction we are looking for the superintendent to go.

Alderman Shaw stated I thank you for that, and also as a former teacher I know that it is difficult to sell change to anyone, to parents, to teachers, anyone. Depending on the enrollment and how things go in the next few years also could depend on how the facilities that we have now are used. So I know it is difficult to accept that maybe one particular elementary school, Chandler School is now used as a preschool building or was used as a preschool building, so there are things that may happen in the future, but I think when it's done it has to be because there is a real need, because the demographics have changed, and parents need to be involved in the development of this. I think that it is very important. It's like anything else, you have to sell it to the residents if you want to make something successful, and I think that's important.

Committeewoman Ambrogi stated just a couple of things. I don't disagree with anything that's been said, however, I think that on the one hand we've actually

been talking about redistricting for several years now in the district without making much headway and the truth is that no matter what we end up doing, somebody is going to be unhappy. I don't think anybody can dispute that because somebody is going to experience change. I do agree that there has to be discussion with the community, but at the same time I think the superintendent has to be able to bring forward ideas that then can be discussed. I think without doing that we're never going to do anything. The other thing I wanted to say in defense of the plan that was brought forward that's now been taken off the table, there has been discussion right from the beginning of the redistricting discussion several years ago, I believe it was 2011 when we started talking about this, there was a recognition that the preschool issue is a major issue that affects many of our elementary buildings, it affects the ability to do effective redistricting. So unfortunately, while I don't disagree with what Alderman Shaw has said, sometimes I think redistricting and reorganization have to happen together because if we don't solve the conundrum of the preschool, we're not going to be able to do any effective redistricting that will allow us to plan for the demographic changes that we see in the city coming down the pike, that have happened and that will continue to happen. We will obviously continue to talk about this, and I just think we need to be cognizant that change is going to be difficult. There is no question that what we end up coming up with is not going to be that easy.

Chairman Corriveau stated right before I get to you Alderman Shea, I think part of the issue, it was my understanding, is that, and perhaps we're dealing somewhat with semantics, reorganization versus redistricting, but I know for many of the parents, and I would share this concern, the idea of K through grade 8 came up. I remember three years ago maybe there were meetings held throughout the city on the K through 8 issue and I think the community spoke out rather loudly at that time saying that that idea didn't have much support in the city of Manchester. I don't know where the notion of K through 8 stands right now, it appears as though

it's no longer on the table for Jewett and Southside, but I believe that issue sort of dovetails with the preschool issue and perhaps the preschool issue is really the first step in figuring out the rest of the redistricting. But I think for some of us the idea that K through 8 would somehow be a part of that was somewhat distressing, and I think many people in the city thought it was an issue that had been resolved a few years ago.

Alderman Shea stated just so that the parents will have chance to speak today, I see the issue as four separate issues. I see the issue as if we wanted to sort of, and without necessarily intermingling them we have a preschool, we have an elementary, we have a middle school, and we have a high school. At each level there has to be discussions made in terms of how it impacts first of all that particular level of education, equally important, and then the intermingling. In other words, I think what was tried created intermingling, putting three issues, preschool and elementary and middle schools, sort of in the same kind of how do you mix them together, and I'm not sure if that's the right way to approach it. I think that if you have a problem with preschool, that's an issue. Before you do anything else you have to settle that particular issue, and then you have to settle the issue in terms of maybe elementary, and then you have to do it to the middle school and the high school. And then if there has to be an intermingling at that stage, that's another process. But again, that's how I see it, it's kind of complicated but that's the way I see it, Mr. Chairman.

Committeewoman Connors stated I do appreciate the feedback from both of you because I know you both have extensive educational experience, especially in Manchester, but I think we do have a lot of questions coming up at the school board meeting, a direction for the superintendent, and I think that this is probably a school board issue at this point unless we're talking about the actual facilities and needing to renovate facilities and needing to bond and such with the aldermanic

board that way. I do have a question regarding facilities though. There was concern with this committee last year. Have you guys had a chance to see the CIP list that came from the school board this year for the actual school buildings?

Alderman Shea stated we have the priority list.

Chairman Corriveau stated maybe we could ask the clerk to distribute that to the members of the committee for our next meeting because I think that's a very good point. I think that's something we should absolutely discuss at our next meeting.

Alderman Shaw stated I have a comment. I want to thank the city for renovating the clock at Hallsville, and I wish I could be there Friday for the clock opening but I have a meeting in Goffstown for the executive board of the county at that same time. I might get over there for part of it. The other thing is that I'd like to congratulate the city for the renovation of Bakersville. Bakersville is a great school, it looks beautiful, it's not in my ward anymore, they took it away from me, but a lot of the residents in my ward go to Bakersville and I had the pleasure of teaching there after I retired and did part-time work there. It is a great school, and I'm very proud of what the city has done and there has been some good work done in the schools, and I hope they continue to do that. Thank you.

Ms. Burkush stated I'd just like to add something. I know that you said security was one of the issues. The Manchester school district was invited by Homeland Security in the state of New Hampshire to attend a 4-day course at FEMA in Maryland. There were six of us who went down and we had police, fire, facilities, and three school district members, an assistant principal at the middle school, Tim Otis, and Liz McDonald, principal at Weston. What we got from that was a template that's an exemplar in terms of an emergency operations plan that we plan to have at every one of our schools. Then each school will have what they call

functional annexes, so that's a little bit different like the facilities are different, so what you would do in this instance would be a little bit different at Bakersville versus at Green Acres. So we plan over probably the next three months is to develop those plans, relook at every single plan and have one consistent plan, and I know that police and fire are really onboard to help us do that. We plan on bringing something forward probably within the next three or four months that will be consistent and really a community effort.

Chairman Corriveau stated that's great news. I think all the members of this committee would look forward to hearing that presentation in a few months and we'll certainly have that.

Chairman Corriveau stated the clerk just informed me since this is a new session of this committee that we need to vote on co-chairs of the committee, so are there any nominations from this committee as to their representatives.

*On motion of Alderman Shaw, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to nominate Alderman Corriveau and Committeewoman Ambrogi as co-chairmen of this committee.*

Chairman Corriveau stated we have some parents with us tonight, and I know one thing we'd like to start doing with this committee is having members of the community reach out to us. That can be anyone from principals to parents groups and we certainly have some issues in this city impacting some parents. With that, if you would give your names for the record, we will let you have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Mike Porter, Ward 8, stated I would like to at some point maybe in the main meeting talk a little bit longer, more extensively. The first thing we do want to say



is that we do appreciate that Dr. Livingston reached out to us early on. We had a meeting and what we really appreciated about that was that she wasn't trying to placate anybody, she wasn't giving anybody false answers, we do appreciate the fact that she listened to us because there are a number of issues that do go into the proposed plan at the time. I think moving forward at this point one of the things is that oftentimes parents get involved and then when something goes their way, they back off. We have every intention, and we want to publicly tell everybody else, we will remain involved. Involvement means attending meetings, meeting with school committee individuals as well as aldermen. We do care about the city. I was born and raised in this city and I do care, I care about the educational future so with that said, I think going forward it would be nice to have a committee appointed by the school board because I think that has fallen on Erica's shoulders and unfortunately it needs to be spread more broadly across the school committee's shoulders. I do think people need to step up to the plate and start taking that challenge on. One person trying to go through maps and numbers in today's day and age, for a city that hasn't done redistricting in 18 years, is probably an impossible task. I do think we need to address as well that having a committee allows parents and the public to be notified of what is going to be discussed. The way it's happening now there are questions of 91-A, what the involvement is and so forth. I would like to see even a joint task committee of the aldermen, school board, parents, and educators.

Mr. Jim Lahout, Ward 8, stated I want to discuss a little bit of redistricting. Alderman Shaw and Alderman Shea and Alderman Corriveau thank you for listening to us. I do believe redistricting, and if I can submit this to the clerk, which is definitions stated of exactly what redistricting is from Black's law, McMillan Dictionary, Wikipedia has a whole thing on redistricting as it pertains to schools, and then also at the January 28, 2013 meeting Dr. Brennan specifically lays out exactly what redistricting means, the altering of the school district

boundary lines to achieve the desire and efficient, effective and equitable utilization of schoolhouse space and resources. So we've already been talking about this for quite some time. But as far as being a Jewett parent; I think where the line got blurred, and what Committeewoman Ambrogi stated, was that we were discussing redistricting but we were also discussing a fundamental change in how we teach our kids, which to me is a completely different issue. I'm sure many of you are following the forums and the blogs and stuff like that, and it does get very heated when it comes to the K through 8 innovation, pre-K, but not so much discussing lines. I think discussing the lines for redistricting as it is defined, would be a lot easier, it's more of a math situation as opposed to a philosophy situation, which should be a whole different conversation, and I'll be the first to admit that I have a lot to learn on that end. We've already learned a lot about Common Core and how we're teaching kids today, and I'll leave my opinions on that to myself, but I'd like to request that this group investigate how we can separate the two moving forward so that if other schools are discussed, again, we will be involved. But the lines and definitions are stated of what's expected for redistricting and what's expected from reorganization.

Chairman Corriveau stated I think maybe what we'll do, at least for the next few months, is maybe have a standing item on our agenda in regards to facilities discussions. That way we can somewhat incorporate some redistricting talk, the appropriate redistricting talk into this committee's discussion, but I know that the board of school committee would like to take a look at a new facilities plan. I think it's important that all members of this committee have an understanding of what city facilities may or may not be available, maybe the discussions we have amongst this committee may lead to ideas that haven't come to the table yet. So I think maybe we'll include a facilities item on our next agenda, obviously we'll continue to discuss the budget. Just a quick housekeeping matter before we adjourn. Is the third Monday of the month typically okay for the members of this

committee? Is there any willingness from this committee to meet the third Monday of May, but I imagine that will be right around the end of the budget season. Do any members of this committee prefer to have an earlier meeting in the month of May in regards to any budget inquiries they may have. I know the third Monday of May may be pushing things, and I know there are some of us that are hoping to get a budget done a little quickly.

Alderman Shaw responded I think you should leave it that if there is a concern they can contact yourself or Committeewoman Ambrogi and we could call a special meeting. We should just leave it as planned.

Chairman Corriveau stated that's fine and I know Karen has some information she's going to be getting to the members of this committee over the next week or two. I guess if any important concerns come up we can call a special meeting, but we'll plan for our regularly scheduled meeting on the third Monday of May.

*There being no further business, on motion of **Alderman Shea**, duly seconded by **School Committeewoman Staub**, it was voted to adjourn.*

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee